

VZCZCXYZ0033
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUCNDT #1410 2062045
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 252045Z JUL 06
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9675

UNCLAS USUN NEW YORK 001410

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

FOR IO/UNP:EBROWN AND ISN/CPI:EWILCOX

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PREL](#) [PTER](#) [AORC](#) [KNNP](#) [UNSC](#) [PGOV](#)

SUBJECT: 1540: P-5 EXPERTS NEAR AGREEMENT ON DRAFT COMMITTEE PROGRAM OF WORK

REF: A. WUCHTE/HOTZ EMAIL--7/3/06

[¶B.](#) STATE 114027

[¶C.](#) WILCOX/BROWN/WUCHTE EMAIL--7/24/06

[¶11.](#) Begin summary: P-5 experts met informally July 24 to discuss a UK draft of the 12-month program of work for the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) (ref A). USUN stressed the U.S. desire for the Committee to agree upon a work program soon and urged the experts to accept a work program addressing the three priority areas and proposals set forth in ref tel. USUN also requested the addition of new language to provide the Committee flexibility to act upon new ideas and respond to new developments in the course of its work. P-5 experts agreed generally to the UK draft as written, but China and Russia objected to inserting language tasking the Committee to develop standards for measuring states' compliance with resolution 1540 (2001). UKUN has circulated a slightly revised version of the text to Committee Chairman and Slovak PermRep Peter Burian (ref C), labeling it as a UK text developed in consultation with P-5 experts. The 1540 Committee meets to discuss the program of work on Thursday, July 27. The Chairman has sought Ambassador Bolton's support in ensuring that the Committee reaches agreement then. End summary.

[¶12.](#) At a meeting July 24 to discuss the UK-drafted program of work for the 1540 Committee, China and Russia presented a few objections to the draft. Note: The UK had prepared the text following a June 13 meeting at which P-5 experts shared views on the Committee's program of work. At the June meeting, the Russian and Chinese delegation specifically objected to the U.S. proposal for the Committee to establish regional- and state-specific assistance priorities for stemming proliferation activity, saying the Committee should not differentiate among states but should work to help all states implement the resolution. End note.

[¶13.](#) Russia said it could have accepted the early draft program, which the Committee experts had prepared, and said time constraints prevented it from gathering views from all relevant parts of the Russian government on the UK draft. It then joined China in opposing language tasking the Committee to work to develop and refine standards for measuring states' compliance with resolution 1540, in preparation for its report to the Council. While USUN argued that the Committee needs to develop such standards, consistent with the requirements of para 6 of resolution 1673 (2005), China said the Committee does not have a mandate to develop such standards. China also opposed identifying specific areas of resolution 1540, such as proliferation financing and means of delivery, for which the Committee should undertake further analysis. France proposed replacing references to compliance and proliferation financing with language noting provisions of resolution 1540 and 1673 that address those issues.

(Comment: France's proposal preserves the substance of the original formulation but avoids using language that are redlines for the Chinese and the Russian delegations. End comment.) Russia also questioned the need for the Committee to promote full understanding of the terms of the resolution, including "Means of Delivery," "Non State Actor" and "Related Materials," arguing (correctly) that the resolution already defines those terms.

¶4. USUN will continue to present the points set forth in reftel at the Committee's July 27 meeting and encourage the Committee to include them in its program of work. Per reftel, USUN will not block consensus if continuing to insist upon these additional proposals would lead to deadlock. For example, because the Chinese and Russian delegations already have opposed specific language to allow the Committee to set regional- and state-specific priorities for technical assistance, USUN will not insist on adding new language to the program of work. Similarly, because other P-5 members are not prepared to insert specific proposals in reftel concerning the development of an assessment template for tracking the submission of implementation plans along with assistance requests and the establishment of an expert pool, USUN will not block consensus if these ideas are not addressed specifically in the program of work.

BOLTON